
From: Sukys, Raymond <FTA>
To: Ossi, Joseph <FTA>
Sent: 3/7/2007 9:39:25 AM
Subject: Honolulu - Capital cost estimates for managed lanes

-----Original Message-----

From: Ryan, James <FTA>
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2007 7:27 AM
To: Carranza, Edward <FTA>; Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>
Cc: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Borinsky, Susan <FTA>
Subject: RE: DTFT60-04-D-00013_ Task Order 010

I suggested that we have the PMOC review the capital cost estimate for the "managed lane" alternative. Local transit opponents in Honolulu cite the recently completed managed-lane facility in Tampa as a prototype for the concept and an illustration of the likely costs. They claim that the City of Honolulu has grossly exaggerated the costs of a similar facility in Honolulu. So the alternative is really a highway facility for carpools, toll-paying single-occupant vehicles, and buses. Actually, the City considered two variants -- one that is more BRT-like and the other that is more toll-lanes oriented. In either case, the central point of the dispute is the capital cost estimate for the highway facility itself given the Tampa experience.

The opponents are sure to repeat their complaints during scoping in April/May. An independent review of the cost estimates and comparison with the Tampa experience would be most helpful when we have to decide whether the City's decision for a transit guideway rather than managed lanes was based on a fair evaluation of the alternatives consistent with NEPA.

A separate issue is rail versus "bus" within the "fixed-guideway" mode chosen by the City Council. The City administration maintains that this is simply a question of vendor and fixed-guideway technology -- maybe rail and maybe rubber-tired, but a fixed guideway in either case. (If it isn't, then we should not let them into PE because they have not considered a busway during AA and can't proceed into PE with two distinct candidate projects on the table.) The technology question will be front-and-center during PE and vendor selection, and the City thinks the cost differences are likely to be small relative to the total cost of the project. That sounds right, so unless someone else thinks that we have some substantial risk there, I do not think that we need to get into the rubber-tired technology option.

Thanks.
Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Carranza, Edward <FTA>
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2007 10:08 AM
To: Luu, Catherine <FTA>; Matley, Ted <FTA>; Sukys, Raymond <FTA>; Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>
Cc: Rogers, Leslie <FTA>; Ryan, James <FTA>; Borinsky, Susan <FTA>
Subject: FW: DTFT60-04-D-00013_ Task Order 010

FYI - From our conference call this past Monday morning, I believe this additional cost/schedule validation effort on the other alternative is what Jim R was requesting, and if not, please advise so we can get it straight with our PMOC.

-----Original Message-----

From: Carranza, Edward <FTA>
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 5:13 PM
To: 'Mccarron_Francis@bah.com'
Subject: Re: DTFT60-04-D-00013_ Task Order 010

Frank: We'll probably ask you to do a cost and schedule validation not only on the rubber tire mode along the LPA, but also on the bus alternative for our due diligence needs. This should not impact your proposal too much, and no impact to the statement of work/scope, but will have to be addressed when performing any initial cost/schedule reviews. We can explain in our pre-quarterly session Monday afternoon. You see, you don't even have the task yet and you're

getting direction(s) from this region. This assignment shouldn't be boring.

-----Original Message-----

From: McCarron, Francis
To: Ridley, Dorian <FTA>
To: Asatoorian, Sepooh <FTA>
Cc: Lyle, Robert
Cc: Martin, Barbara [USA]
Cc: Shaw, Jessica <FTA>
Cc: Harper, James <FTA>
Cc: Luu, Catherine <FTA>
Cc: Mccarron_Francis@bah.com
Cc: Cham Laura
Cc: Tahir, Nadeem <FTA>
Cc: Carranza, Edward <FTA>
Cc: Belizaire Justine
Sent: Mar 6, 2007 12:24 PM
Subject: RE: DTFT60-04-D-00013_ Task Order 010

HI Dorian & Steve

Attached is BAH's proposal for Task Order # 10- Region 9 - City and County of Honolulu Fixed Guideway project.

Our proposal includes: a cover letter (PDF), a cost model including the required Section B and H2 table (PDF and xls), a cost narrative (PDF and word) and Task Order (PDF and word).

Our proposal is consistent with the total hours requested and the eighteen month period of performance. The distribution of hours among the CLINs, although different that requested, has been coordinated with the FTA Task Order Manager.

The BAH team looks forward to working with FTA on the Honolulu Fixed Guideway Project.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks Frank

From: Dorian.Ridley@dot.gov [mailto:Dorian.Ridley@dot.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2007 8:19 AM
To: McCarron, Francis; Sepooh.Asatoorian@dot.gov
Cc: Lyle, Robert; Martin, Barbara [USA]; Jessica.Shaw@dot.gov; James.Harper@dot.gov; Dorian.Ridley@dot.gov; Catherine.Luu@dot.gov
Subject: RE: DTFT60-04-D-00013_ Task Order 010
Importance: High

Good afternoon Frank,

Please see attached Booz Allen new Task Order Proposal 010, Contract No: DTFT60-04-D-0013 for

AR00149516

Region IX County of Honolulu New Start Project. This will serve as a formal and final proposal TOP. Please submit your proposal, including a completed Section B and Section H-2 ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS table for incrementally funding by 2:00pm on Wednesday, March 7, 2007. If circumstance prevent you from meeting this critical deadline please advise immediately. Please confirm receipt of email by replying to sender. Should you have any questions please don't hesitate in contacting me. I thank you in advance for your immediate attention to this critical subject matter.

Thank you,

Dorian Ridley